

REMARKS

Applicants will present support *infra* for selected subject matter claimed herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson (U.S. Patent 4,747,897) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Patent 4,697,923).

The Examiner rejected claims 35, 36 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones et al. and optionally Abc et al. (U.S. Patent 4,495,017) and JP 02145335.

The Examiner rejected claims 24 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson and Jones et al. as applied to claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41, and 43 above, and further in view of admitted prior art (Specification pages 1-3 and page 8, lines 10-13).

The Examiner rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson and Jones et al. as applied to claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41, and 43 above, and further in view of either one of Ueno et al. (U.S. Patent 4,765,860) or Kusano et al. (U.S. Patent 5,425,832).

The Examiner rejected claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson and Jones et al. as applied to claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41, and 43 above, and further in view of Kodokian (U.S. Patent 5,762,741).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections with arguments presented *infra*.

Support For Selected Subject Matter Claimed Herein

The feature of "coating a second resin comprising the thermosetting resin on a surface of a conductor; and laminating the resin-impregnated fluoropolymer matrix to the conductor having the second resin thereon, wherein the conductor, thermosetting resin of the second resin, and the remaining layer of resin are disposed on the resin-impregnated fluoropolymer matrix following the laminating step" is recited in claim 23 and similarly in claims 60, 62, and 70. Applicants' specification provides support for the preceding feature on page 12, line 21 - page 13, line 17.

The feature of "wherein the particles are inorganic particles each having a spherical shape and a diameter of less than 10 microns" is recited in claims 25, 67, and 73. Applicants' specification provides support for the preceding feature on page 7, line 23 - page 8, line 2.

The feature of "providing the fluoropolymer matrix comprises introducing the particles into the fluoropolymer matrix in a form of liquid inorganic particles" is recited in claims 33, 68, and 74. Applicants' specification provides support for the preceding feature on page 8, lines 4-9.

The feature of "wherein the thermosetting resin includes solvent having a molecular weight not exceeding the molecular weight of methyl ethyl ketone" is recited in claims 35, 65, and 71. Applicants' specification provides support for the preceding feature on page 9, lines 20-23.

The feature of "wherein the step of providing the varnish having the thermosetting resin

thercinc comprises adjusting the viscosity of the varnish so as to control a degree to which the thermosetting resin in the varnish impregnates the fluoropolymer matrix during the processing step" is recited in claims 69 and similarly in claims 63-64. Applicants' specification provides support for the preceding feature on page 10, lines 12-20.

The feature of "wherein the contrasting dye facilitates a visual contrast in the visible portion of the electromagnetic spectrum between the conductive layer and the fluoropolymer matrix" is recited in claim 58. Applicants' specification provides support for the preceding feature on page 10, lines 8-11 ("contrasting dye or pigment can be included in the varnish if enhanced optical contrast or fluorescence with respect to conductive layers is sought"). The word "pigment" in the preceding quote from the specification lends support to phrase "visible portion of the electromagnetic spectrum" in claim 58, in light of the definition of "pigment". The word "pigment" is defined as "a coloring matter" in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 638 (2d ed. 1958). The word "pigment" is defined as "a substance used as coloring" in The American Heritage Dictionary 939 (2d ed. 1985).

35 U.S.C. §103(a)Claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41 and 43

The Examiner rejected claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson (U.S. Patent 4,747,897) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Patent 4,697,923).

Since claims 40-41 and 43 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 40-41 and 43 is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 23 is not unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones, because Johnson in view of Jones does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23. For example, Johnson in view of Jones does not teach or suggest "coating a second resin comprising the thermosetting resin on a surface of a conductor; and laminating the resin-impregnated fluoropolymer matrix to the conductor having the second resin thereon, wherein the conductor, thermosetting resin of the second resin, and the remaining layer of resin are disposed on the resin-impregnated fluoropolymer matrix following the laminating step."

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 23 is not unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones, and that claim 23 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 25 and 32 depend from claim 23, Applicants contend that claims 25 and 32 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claims 35, 36 and 45

The Examiner rejected claims 35, 36 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being

unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones et al. and optionally Abc et al. (U.S. Patent 4,495,017) and JP 02145335.

Since claims 36 and 45 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 36 and 45 is moot.

Since claim 35 depends from claim 23, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claim 33 is likewise not unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones and Abc and JP 0214533 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 24 and 33

The Examiner rejected claims 24 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson and Jones et al. as applied to claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41, and 43 above, and further in view of admitted prior art (Specification pages 1-3 and page 8, lines 10-13).

Since claim 24 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 24 is moot.

Since claim 33 depends from claim 23, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Johnson in view of Jones under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claim 33 is likewise not unpatentable over Johnson and Jones in view of admitted prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 37

The Examiner rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson and Jones et al. as applied to claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41, and 43 above, and further in view of either one of Ueno et al. (U.S. Patent 4,765,860) or Kusano et al. (U.S. Patent

5,425,832).

Since claim 37 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 37 is moot.

Claim 49

The Examiner rejected claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson and Jones et al. as applied to claims 23, 25, 32, 40, 41, and 43 above, and further in view of Kodokian (U.S. Patent 5,762,741).

Since claim 49 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 49 is moot.

09/781,730

14

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 12/17/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

09/781,730

15